

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

#### ***"Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102"***

In paragraphs 3 and 4 the Examiner has objected to the claims as lacking novelty in view of Tabata et al. We respectfully submit that this is not the case.

In particular, the current claim 1 requires that the printer prints print areas, each of which includes identity data. We respectfully submit that this is not shown by Tabata et al.

In particular, as identified by the Examiner, Tabata et al describes having a two-dimensional code identifying linkage information as shown in Figure 2 and described in column 10, lines 8 to 12. This "identity data" is provided at one location of the form, and therefore can be considered to be provided in one particular print area. The other print areas (referred to as dicon areas) in Tabata et al do not include such identity information. Instead, the identity of these dicons is represented to in the two-dimensional code mentioned above.

As a result, each of the print areas does not include identity data.

The Examiner has drawn our attention to the presence of text data/graphic data that is provided in each of the print areas and which the Examiner asserts "differentiates" the areas. However, this is standard printed information and would correspond to the document information referred to in claim and does not therefore constitute identity data.

In this regard, we note that the text/graphic data, whilst being different in each area, does not identify the area and nor is the data in any way described to be identity data indicative of identity information.

We respectfully submit that this is important as the presence of such identity data, in each of the print areas in the current claim 1, allows the printer to sense the identity information

included in a given print area and then identify the respective print area from the identity information. Thus, claim 1 provides a system that allows a printer to sense identity information provided in a print area, and from that identify the print area.

In contrast to this, the teaching of Tabata et al is that the sensor needs to sense the two-dimensional coded data barcode to determine linkage information for the dicons. The printer would then be able to identify any one of the areas. However, this requires that the sensor sense coded data provided in an area other than the print area that is being identified.

Thus, Tabata et al does not describe a system that allows a sensor to sense identity data provided in a given print area to thereby allow that print area to be identified.

In view of this, we respectfully submit that claim 1 is novel and inventive over the teaching of Tabata et al.

Similar arguments also apply to claims 19 and 37 which require that the print area include identity data which differentiates the print area from other print areas including identity data.

In addition to this however, claim 19 also explicitly states that the printer is for printing document information onto a print area also including identity data. In this regard, we note that it is not possible to print document information onto the area containing the two-dimensional bar code of Tabata et al as this will obscure both the document information and the bar code, in this instance.


In the event that the Examiner does not accept our submissions regarding the independent claims we have added additional dependent claims 59 to 61 which clarify that the identity data is indicative of the identity of the respective print area. This is not taught or suggested by Tabata et al, which does not describe any arrangement in which a print area includes identity information indicative of an identity of the print area.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 61, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

PAUL LAPSTUN

Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

Applicant:

---

SIMON ROBERT WALMSLEY

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

[kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762